REMARKS

Claims 1-23, 25-42, 44, 47, and 48 are pending. Claim 49-51 are new. Claims 6-22, 29-41, and 47 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim 1 is amended to further patentably distinguish over the cited references. Support for these amendments is found throughout the as-filed application, and specifically, for example, on page 28, line 9 through page 29, line 3 and in Figure 3A. No new matter has been added.

Support for new claim 49 also is found, for example, on page 28, line 9 through page 29, line 3 of the as-filed application.

Support for new claims 50 and 51 is found, for example, on page 5, line 30 through page 6, line 11 of the as-filed application.

Claims 1-5, 23, 25-28, 42, 44, and 48 are further amended to clarify the claims.

Summary of Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner and his supervisor, Melba Bumgarner, for the courtesy of the 23 November 2010 interview with Applicants' undersigned representative. Proposed amendments to independent claim 1 were discussed.

No agreement was reached.

Objections to the Specification

The abstract was objected to for improper language and format.

The abstract is amended, as indicated above, obviating this rejection. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully disagree. One of ordinary skill in the art would understand that "a second storage device" would be associated with a network computer. To advance prosecution, however, claim 1 is amended to remove the feature of "a second storage device," obviating this rejection.

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for reciting "a display unit" and "a value input device" when claim 1 recites "a display unit" and "a value input device." Claim 23 is amended to recite "a second display unit" and "a second value input device," obviating this rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the outstanding rejections in view of the amendments and the following remarks. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 23, 25-28, 42, and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0151363 (Letovsky) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0186858 (McGovern).

Applicants respectfully disagree that claim 1 is unpatentable over Letovsky and McGovern, considered alone or in combination, as discussed in the previous responses. In order to advance prosecution, however, claim 1 is amended. Claim 1, as-amended, recites in part an operational event recorder that is part of a network computer:

> the operational event recorder including:
> a first single-write data storage device,
> an operational event controller, the operational event controller including a processor and a memory device,
> a first memory buffer, and
> a second memory buffer,
> the operational event recorder being configured to:
> periodically check a first gaming apparatus to determine when an operational event has occurred,
> retrieve operational event data when an operational event has occurred,
> store the operational event data in the first memory buffer,
> when the first memory buffer is full, write the operational event data to the first single-write data storage device, and
> when the operational event data is being written to the first single-write data storage device from the first memory buffer, store first new operational event data in the second memory buffer.
> (Emphasis added).

As explained on page 29, lines 1-3 of the as-filed application, by "waiting until the memory buffer is full, the operational event recorder 120 may prevent continuous and excessive write operations to preserve the reliability of the data storage device 138."

Letovsky describes an apparatus that allows a player remotely located from wagering devices to make wagers on the wagering devices using funds on deposit in an account. (Abstract). Letovsky does describe "Video capture, time stamping, streaming, buffereing, archiving, and win/lose/pay archiving" for a remote game play system. (Figures 1 and 3-5). Letovsky does not further describe or characterize this buffering operation, however. Further, nowhere does Letovsky describe an operational event recorder including a first and a

second memory buffer, much less that "when the operational event data is being written to the first single-write data storage device from the first memory buffer," the operational event recorder is configured to "store first new operational event data in the second memory buffer." (Claim 1).

McGovern describes a write-once-read-many (WORM) storage system that employs large-capacity and relatively inexpensive disks in connection with a file system on a file server. (Abstract). McGovern does describe a nonvolatile random access memory (NVRAM) that is filled in parallel with a buffer cache, after each client request is completed, but before the result of the request is returned to the requesting client. (Paragraph 0037). Similar to Letovsky, however, nowhere does McGovern describe an operational event recorder including a first and a second memory buffer, much less one that operates such that "when the operational event data is being written to the first single-write data storage device from the first memory buffer," the operational event recorder is configured to "store first new operational event data in the second memory buffer." (Claim 1).

Thus, Letovsky and McGovern, considered alone or in combination, fail to describe the features of the operational event recorder recited claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore not obvious in view of Letovsky and McGovern.

The above-referenced dependent claims incorporate the features of independent claim 1. These dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 48 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Letovsky in view of McGovern and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0128059 (Baltz).

Baltz describes a gaming machine adapted to print validated tickets for a game player that includes a microprocessor for controlling game operation (e.g., slot machine operation). (Abstract). Baltz does describe a dataport unit (DPU) that is provided as a data concentrator and buffering communication unit to address multiple gaming machines and to communicate with the poller. (Paragraph 0018). Nowhere, however, does Baltz describe an operational event recorder including a first and a second memory buffer, much less that "when the operational event data is being written to the first single-write data storage device from the first memory buffer," the operational event recorder is configured to "store first new operational event data in the second memory buffer." (Claim 1). Claim 48 incorporates the features recited in claim 1, and is patentable for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

The claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, allowance of the claims at the earliest possible date is requested.

If prosecution of this application can be assisted by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (510) 663-1100.

Applicants do not believe that any additional fees are required to facilitate the filing of this Amendment. However, if it is determined that such fees are due, please charge such additional fees to Deposit Account No. 504480 (Order No. IGT1P545).

Respectfully submitted,
WEAVER AUSTIN VILLENEUVE & SAMPSON LLP

/Stephen C. Glade/
Stephen C. Glade
Reg. No. 57,601

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100